

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING – WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2008

**EPC WALKING TOUR: OLD MIDDLEFIELD WAY AREA
EPC TO MEET AT SIERRA VISTA PARK,
CORNER OF SIERRA VISTA AVENUE AND PLYMOUTH STREET
5:45 P.M.**

**REGULAR EPC MEETING IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE EPC WALKING TOUR
PLAZA CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL – 500 CASTRO STREET
7:00 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson INKS.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Commissioners ANDERSON, BROWN, FERNANDEZ, McALISTER, TRONTELL, Vice Chairperson SODERBERG and Chairperson INKS.

Commissioners Absent: (TRONTELL and BROWN absent from walking tour only.)

Staff Present: Aarti Shrivastava, Planning Manager; Martin Alkire, Principal Planner; C. Shelly Emerson, Senior Assistant City Attorney.

Others Present: There were approximately 10 members of the public in the audience.

2.1 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WAY WALKING TOUR

The Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) hosted a walking tour of the Old Middlefield Way area. The EPC met at Sierra Vista Park (corner of Sierra Vista Avenue and Plymouth Street) at 5:45 p.m. and followed along Sierra Vista Avenue, Leghorn Street, Rengstorff Avenue, Wyandotte Street, Independence Avenue and Old Middlefield Way and then returned to Sierra Vista Park. The walking tour allowed the EPC and members of the public the opportunity to observe existing land uses, buildings, streetscapes and other public improvements in the vicinity.

3. **MINUTES APPROVAL**—None.

4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

The public input period was opened.

Theo Nykostrakas, resident of Mountain View and a member of the Senior Advisory Task Force, said that he was unable to connect to a City meeting on-line and could not print the agenda from the URL file. He said that the City's software system required synchronization and updating.

Seeing no one further wishing to speak, the public comment period was closed.

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 **Housing Element: Housing Needs Analysis**

The staff presentation was made by Scott Plambaeck, Senior Planner, who provided an overview of preliminary key findings of the City's housing needs prior to the September 3, 2008 meeting. The focus of the meeting would be on population, employment trends, housing affordability and special needs groups. He also provided a brief background of what had been covered at previous meetings and of Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers for the San Francisco Bay Area provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), which the Housing Element must accommodate. He pointed out that the State gives the EPC flexibility in identifying the housing needs and gives the community some flexibility on how to create policies to meet those needs. A table projecting Extremely Low-Income (ELI) needs was presented and certain definitions of terms that will be used in the consideration of the Housing Element were clarified. In conclusion, he asked the EPC to consider the three questions listed on Page 2 of the staff report in regard to housing trends, special needs groups and types of housing, and housing needs and strategies. Commissioners asked questions and requested clarification from staff regarding the staff presentation.

Commissioner TRONTELL referred to Page 6 of the preliminary key findings of the Housing Needs Analysis in Attachment 1 to the staff report that states: "A significant number of new jobs will be lower paying...and one-third to one-half of all new jobs in Mountain View will be at lower- and moderate-income levels." She asked for information about how land use decisions made by the Commission can influence the types of jobs that are created and if that can be changed by the Commission so there is opportunity to create jobs in Mountain View.

Principal Planner Martin Alkire responded that ABAG uses a regional projections model that looks at industry trends and jobs growth in certain industries, and that is applied to different cities looking at the amount of available land and under-utilized land in each city's General Plan and specific plan areas. Therefore, certain General Plan land use designations or decisions made at the local level could influence the availability of land for additional job-creating industries.

Commissioner TRONTELL asked what could be done to assist the EPC in understanding what specific actions could be taken to improve the situation in Mountain View so workers would have higher compensation levels; for example, encouraging certain types of industry. The Principal Planner commented that more intense allowances for development in high-tech hubs or certain areas could attract higher-paying professional jobs.

The Commissioner asked for clarification on the reference to vacancy rates being low and lower than the generally accepted ideal vacancy level and why vacancy rates are so low if the housing is not affordable. Staff responded that additional information on this topic will be provided to the EPC at a later meeting.

Commissioner SODERBERG asked for a breakdown of the "household type" pie chart on Page 10 and the "48 percent" figure for "single person or nonfamily household." Staff indicated that the information will be brought back to the Commission at a later date.

The Commissioner questioned the estimation on Page 6 that one-third to one-half of all new jobs in Mountain View will be at lower- and moderate-income wages. The Senior Planner explained that the Housing Element consultant was looking at jobs, such as retail and service jobs, which tend to pay lower than the median income in the area. Another Commissioner pointed out that the ratio of retail jobs to total jobs in the City of Mountain View on Page 6 does not equal one-third to one-half. The Principal Planner said other categories were added there that were possibly lower-paying jobs.

Commissioner SODERBERG asked the following questions: On Page 5, what is the degree of accuracy from ABAG projections for persons per household? On Page 7, under Housing Affordability, what is the method of determining how "the purchase price of a home would roughly need to be less than \$430,000?" What is the current price range of housing? What is the procedure of subsidization if people cannot afford a certain level of housing cost?

Commissioner BROWN asked if technical jobs on Page 6 would fall under the manufacturing, wholesale and transportation category. Staff explained that, although some might fall in the professional category, a better definition will be provided. The Commissioner commented that a breakout of technical jobs, which

are generally higher-paying jobs, would provide a clearer picture of what is driving the cost of housing up versus what is impacting rents and lower-priced housing.

Commissioner SODERBERG requested a breakdown comparing utilities to actual rent per month and a breakdown of the gross annual income of the extremely low-income, single person on Page 4 to a monthly amount, which would include the cost of rent per month and the cost of utilities. This information would provide a better idea of what is available to rent for that amount of money.

Chairperson INKS asked about ABAG assumptions referred to on Page 5 in their modeling with regard to a nominal level of economic growth or demographic trend. Staff replied that the 2007 projections took into account the dip in jobs due to the dot-com job loss, and that was projected out and adjusted to the year 2025. As such, some of the recent economic activity was not taken into account while some baseline assumptions were used throughout the future projections. The Chairperson inquired if the models have been validated with actual data on a statistical basis and if the ABAG forecast for population and jobs growth has been validated for Mountain View.

Chairperson INKS commented that on Page 6, the wording "A significant number of new jobs will be lower paying" may be misleading because the estimation that one-third to one-half of new jobs in Mountain View will be lower to moderate income also captures part of the middle-income class. He added that actual growth seems to be weighted toward moderate income. The Principal Planner pointed out that these projections are based on the existing General Plan, which was last updated in 1992, so moving forward with additional General Plan changes could skew the projections based on the amount of land that gets adjusted to accommodate different types of industries and jobs.

Another Commissioner referred to regional housing needs for the very low income in the phrase on Page 2 that says "...local governments must adopt land-use plans and regulatory schemes that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development." He asked what would happen if no one wanted to develop the land that is identified. Staff responded that policies are developed and different land use changes are made in hopes that the land will be developed for housing or other uses.

On Page 3, a Commissioner inquired if the generally accepted measure for housing affordability that includes principle and interest refers to the national, regional or local level or is generally accepted.

Commissioner McALISTER asked the following series of questions:

1. On Page 3, is the reference to "extremely low-income households" a national, regional or local average? On Page 5, is the anticipated increase in 13,700 people and almost 6,000 households an ABAG projection? On Page 7, what are the reasons that "public agencies, school districts, social services and child and elder care will continue to have a difficult time in attracting people to work in Mountain View as affordable housing becomes more difficult to find." In addition, staff was asked to find out if HUD ties into Mountain View or California. The Senior Planner described some of the problems for retaining work force are affordable housing and attracting employees to the area because of the cost of living.
2. On Page 7, under the "high price of single-family detached homes," the Commissioner asked if a study has been done on the cultural effect of having a lower number ratio or having a ratio of renters to affordable, single-family homes. The Principal Planner explained that past Councils have expressed a concern or an interest in providing more ownership housing and one of the City's General Plan policies encourages additional ownership housing.
3. On Page 8, the Commissioner pointed out an ideal ratio of home owners to renters, and the Principal Planner said the ratio ranges from community to community based on each community's particular values or conditions. He asked if a ratio can be defined that might work better. Under "rental subsidies are generally needed for extremely low-income and very low-income households," who pays for the assistance? Does the City pay all the expense for these very low- and extremely low-income households? Is any other government, Federal, State or County housing assistance available?

The Senior Planner explained that both Federal and State programs are used to subsidize affordable housing and the City also typically provides funding. All the funding sources are combined in a package to lower the debt of a project at the point where the lower rents are enough to sustain the project.

4. The same Commissioner asked about the base of the City's housing allotment for very low income and if all the funds for assistance were expended every year. The Senior Planner responded that the City has some local money from the Below-Market-Rate Housing Program and other local housing funds and, although some money is uncommitted, typically the money is used for as many housing projects as possible.
5. The Commissioner clarified that his inquiry was in regard to housing assistance for very low-income renters and asked if the City has assisted rental income. Would it be at below-market rate? Would it be used up after a

period of time? Is there any source of funding that is continuous for assisted living? Staff spoke of the difficulty of rental subsidies and Section Eight, a Federal program administered through the County of Santa Clara's Housing Authority available to very low-income tenants. It is a heavily used program and the wait for the program is currently closed. The funding that the City has available has been used to create rental housing because that assists the largest number of people in the community and the population that, in the City's Consolidated Plan, is identified as having the highest housing needs.

6. The same Commissioner commented that money is being used to build facilities and not to subsidize the rent, and staff confirmed the funding sources cannot be used for rental subsidies. He added that people with a very low income who have a place to stay may not be able to sustain the rental. The Commissioner asked if those properties are under rent control. Staff explained that the properties are built as subsidized housing and the rent stays low for the life of the property. He said it is not rent control and explained the restrictions based on the funding sources that were used to develop them.
7. The Commissioner confirmed with staff that an independent developer owns that project and part of being allowed to develop it would be for the developer to agree to keep the rents low. He asked if a profit can be made out of these projects, and staff said it is difficult for anybody to make a profit off that because all the money from the rents is needed to cover the ongoing operating costs of that property.
8. The Commissioner asked about lack of incentive to do these projects for the developer, and staff replied that the City's existing subsidized housing is all developed by nonprofit housing developers who are not in the business of making a profit. Do these housing projects also have the same concerns as housing problems such as overcrowding of the rooms or the housing maintenance? Staff replied that the properties are monitored annually by the City and by every other funding source and do not have these types of problems. The Commissioner asked if the developers have a time limit for keeping rents low for 50 years or is that indefinite and staff advised that the agreements run for 55 to 65 years.
9. On Page 9, the second paragraph states: "the City currently requires 10 percent of units built to be either provided as below-market-rate or an in-lieu fee to be paid." Does the other 90 percent ever increase to become unaffordable or how much of an increase does that take it up from different categories? Staff said that specific number would have to work from a market standpoint for the developer and the buyer.

10. On Page 9, in the paragraph entitled "Vacancy Rates Are Low," is the ideal vacancy rate of 4.5 percent to 5.0 percent national, regional or local? Staff indicated that point would be clarified by the Housing Element consultant.
11. On Page 10, the first paragraph states: "San Jose, Sunnyvale and Santa Clara County ranked No. 14 of the 80 least affordable metro areas nationwide." The Commissioner pointed out the redundancy that San Jose and Sunnyvale are included in the County of Santa Clara.
12. On Page 10, under "Special Housing Needs and Need Groups," reference was made to "The Housing Element must take into account any local factors that create an extraordinary need for such housing,..." Do we ever look at illegal immigrants? Staff said that there are programs that have addressed housing for immigrant groups or transitional housing.
13. On Page 11, under "Significant Growth in Senior Population Projected," "The 2000 Census indicated that 37.8 percent of the elderly population in Mountain View had a disability." What is the range of accuracy of that percentage?
14. On Page 12, who pays for barrier-free housing and is this type of housing built by a developer, a governmental agency or a nonprofit? The Senior Planner stated that the Building Code requires some units to be accessible, and the idea of being close to services and transit is more of a policy with regard to where to place housing.
15. On Page 13, has a study been done for homeless housing needs to find out if they would be better served from the County level as in economic size development versus small housing versus large project or dormitory type? Is there a fund that we give to the County for homeless shelters? Staff replied that the current model is called Housing First, which provides permanent housing for the homeless instead of shelters.

Commissioner BROWN commented that Mountain View uses a share of its CDBG money and supports several homeless shelters which are located in adjoining cities. A staff member added that the homeless move from community to community and it is difficult to identify which community they belong to, so regional shelters have been set up.

Commissioner ANDERSON asked if there are other strict ways of accounting for new housing being built and other housing being removed in terms of State guidelines. The Senior Planner explained the process of reporting to the State the units that are being removed so the existing number is known. On the City level, concerns and policies are in place to try to help move the existing renters in a

development to additional affordable housing locations. It is not a State requirement but more of a Council-driven policy.

The same Commissioner said that the City must then classify the removed housing units in terms of affordability. He asked how specifically does 291 Evandale Avenue interplay with the current Housing Element activity in regard to removal of some housing at a certain level and proposed other housing at a certain level. The Senior Planner responded that reporting involves stating that a certain number of units was lost. The Evandale Avenue development has not been reported because those units have not yet been built. The Commissioner followed up by asking if the removal of the units was already reported or not until the new ones are built? He said the statement on the top of Page 6 that states: "A significant number of new jobs will be lower paying" should be reworded for preciseness because it is misleading.

Commissioner SODERBERG spoke about the status of the three dwelling units that are either being constructed or permitted. He asked if these units would be accredited against the ABAG allotment and segregated into extremely low income all the way up to above moderate income to determine the "fair share" of the State-wide need to the cities and counties within the region. The Principal Planner stated that projects that have building permits issued after January 1, 2007 would be credited toward the current RHNA. However, most of the units on the housing status map are predominately all above moderate income market-rate-housing units and would not count toward the extremely low-income category. The Commissioner confirmed with staff that according to RHNA 2007-2014, the 2,599 total required units will be met in part by the current projects in the pipeline.

Commissioner BROWN commented relative to the chart showing the proximity of the property to transit does not necessarily mean that the transit is accessible within a half-mile as the crow flies.

Commissioner McALISTER confirmed with staff that the data on the map is approximately two months old and it is updated monthly.

The public hearing was opened.

Theo Nykostrakas, Mountain View resident and member of the Senior Advisory Task Force, spoke about Shelter Plus Care, an organization that works in the County of Santa Clara only, to help locate housing for the disabled and is connected with HUD. He spoke of his concern that the views of young people, as well as older people, should be provided to properly assist in gathering reports and information correctly to present to ABAG.

Duncan MacVicar with Alpha Mega Housing Group said his organization works toward providing housing for homeless people in northern Santa Clara County. In addition, he is a member of the Board of Directors of Community Services Agency (CSA) and statistics have been maintained for two years by CSA that the homeless population in Mountain View is bigger than the numbers in the 2007 survey.

Bruce England, Mountain View resident and member of the Environmental Sustainability Task Force, spoke about putting environmentally sustainable housing in Mountain View as an option for people. On the transportation issues, his Task Force will provide a report for consideration by the Commission containing a proposal on a bicycle and pedestrian path linking Whisman Road with Grant Road and El Camino Real.

Roy Hayter spoke on behalf of Advocates for Affordable Housing, who support the housing needs report as a starting point for the Housing Element and would like better, clearer and more detailed definitions. The group is not sure whether the percentage of household income that is allowable for housing is 33 percent or 30 percent. He spoke in support of the inclusion for the first time of extended low-income housing as a separate category and encourages giving it a high priority. Balanced and sustainable growth is needed for a sustainable and healthy economy in Mountain View, so all income levels can afford to live in the City. He also supported the project on Evandale Avenue, which needs further attention to provide better accommodation for lower-income housing in Mountain View. He also spoke in favor of a better supply of housing for the homeless in Mountain View.

Bill Maston, local architect, spoke in regard to supply and demand as it relates to housing. He added that by placing constraints on developers in terms of what they can build in the City, growth is limited. He said that part of the matrix of affordable housing is dealing with densities and allowing any level of housing, whether it is affordable or premium housing, for those who want to live close by and have it available to them. He also suggested that developers look at marketing trends and the demographics of the new, younger employees that are filling the job positions in the valley and who are more interested in the services available to them in the area than the types of dwellings.

Joan McDonald pointed out that as housing gets tight, rents go up and the units that are not affordable to lower- than moderate-income people become less affordable unless they are within the City's managed, nonprofit housing developments. She spoke in support of the dispersal of below market-rate-housing units throughout the City instead of collecting in-lieu fees.

Seeing no one further wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Chairperson INKS suggested that the Commission identify opportunities and any constraints that are measurable that should be addressed in the City's Housing Element update to judge how the plan is working.

Commissioner ANDERSON said that the ABAG numbers are somehow applied to Mountain View, and he suggested addressing the inclusion of the development targeted for NASA Ames, which is the most identifiable source of new jobs, new housing and educational institutions in the City. He suggested that the staff report recommendation that the generally accepted measure for housing "affordability" is spending less than "33 percent" of gross household income on housing costs should remain as "30 percent." He said statements like that are basically not relevant to the Bay Area unless the language says "generally accepted across the country." On another point, he said the reference to "59 percent rental" seems to be high and suggested changing the language to: "with all the expected housing in the pipeline, we should be at 49 percent in a few years." In that way NASA Ames is more specific to Mountain View and not an insignificant consideration for the future.

Commissioner McALISTER brought up concerns in regard to challenges addressed in the Housing Element update. One challenge is addressing who is going to develop the properties, especially for the low and very low income, and the source of money that is going to be used for the development. If nonprofits do not step forward and do it, it is identified as a problem with no solution. Additionally, he expressed interest in looking at the trend for development in Mountain View as it relates to the younger people and the ramifications of living in multiple-story rowhouses throughout the life of a family.

Commissioner SODERBERG pointed out a challenge in regard to methods to entice and attract developers to come into these programs the City wants to promote when other projects are more profitable, whether it is in Mountain View or somewhere else. He expressed concern that, so far, just part of the plan has been considered and not all the questions have been answered or addressed.

Commissioner ANDERSON commented that the housing needs analysis is essentially a data book that provides State law requirements and meets ABAG and some Mountain View requirements. Although the Commission has a lot of work to do, staff is not portraying the document as the draft Housing Element.

Commissioner TRONTELL gave feedback on looking at the longer-term needs and giving consideration to some of the changes in demographics that will be happening over the life of the General Plan. She asked for more information on the homeless housing needs that are larger than the reported data would indicate for a better understanding of those needs and to factor that into General Plan activities.

Commissioner FERNANDEZ commented in regard to the special needs groups that are required by State law that another group deserving of special treatment is public safety officers, who are a critically important group who should be covered because they would be needed in the City in case of an emergency.

Commissioner ANDERSON concurred with adding public safety as a special needs group and added teachers as well. He would appreciate more information on the homeless situation in Mountain View and the policies of neighboring cities to get more educated about the situation of homelessness in Santa Clara County. He would like to see backup to support the evidence presented by a member of the public that says Mountain View's housing situation does not stop at its boundaries.

Commissioner BROWN recommended that one strategy would be to look at surplus land and, although she was not aware of any surplus land in Mountain View, the housing on Evelyn Avenue is being built on City-owned property. She thought it would be helpful to the Commission to look at an inventory for land that could potentially be zoned for housing to become informed of the pros and cons of each one.

Commissioner TRONTELL supported the statements of Commissioners FERNANDEZ and ANDERSON in regard to housing for public safety workers and teachers and suggested paying attention to that in future efforts of the Commission.

Chairperson INKS commented that the presence of the Housing Element consultant at the roundtable on September 3 would be useful to answer a number of questions probing into detail. He also suggested that an addendum to this session would be useful for the Commission to give staff better feedback with their thoughts being clearer and more succinct and to allow them to absorb all this information better.

Commissioner SODERBERG commented that in the future, discussion about housing at a certain cost will include the quality of design, materials and construction, and minimum standards should be set, particularly to ensure economy and a level of quality. Also, if code requirements are going to be met for a given amount of dollars, only so many square feet will be allowed, and he questioned the adequacy of that.

Commissioner ANDERSON commented that representatives from various nonprofit groups will be present at the roundtable on September 3. He suggested in this Housing Element process that business owners or employers also be invited to speak to the Commission or to be available for questions from the Commission. He suggested getting input from employers of larger retail establishments and

information on where employees are coming from, how they are getting by and the issues faced in retention.

The Principal Planner stated that in the scope of this process of updating the Housing Element, staff would organize a forum or meeting with other stakeholder groups to get additional information to the Commission. He said the roundtable on September 3 was a first attempt at getting some specific information from Mountain View-based groups.

Commissioner McALISTER asked if Mountain View's ratio of open space to development is something that would be addressed in this Housing Element. Whereas, if ABAG requires a certain amount of housing and Mountain View wants so much open space per population, is density a factor or the correlation of the ramifications of building housing and the effect throughout the City and the related services?

The Principal Planner responded that when the General Plan is updated, open space and the Housing Element will be addressed and will have to be internally consistent and cannot conflict with each other.

Commissioner McALISTER asked if ABAG requirements would supersede the Commission's actions regarding citizens' input from the EPC meetings. The Principal Planner said that the expectation from the State HCD that is filtered through ABAG is that the local communities make every attempt to meet the housing allocation they are given through the RHNA process. There are competing interests at the local level that will have to play out as policies are drafted and there will always be competing priorities on how the community addresses housing needs, where housing will go and how to blend in or integrate additional housing into existing neighborhoods.

The Commissioner inquired if it is projected that Mountain View would be built out by 2014 based on projects and requirements. The Principal Planner said that there is no plan or projection regarding the build-out of the City, and the trend over the years has been to recycle land into new or different land uses. The Commissioner asked if ABAG will state that the City is built out at some point unless somebody wants to redevelop. The Principal Planner said the continual trend throughout the projections from ABAG has been to forecast continued growth for the region in terms of jobs and housing.

The Commissioner inquired as to the perspective of the City of Mountain View in regard to meeting the allocation of housing units from ABAG, and staff responded that the expectation is that local communities will try and meet the allocation they receive from ABAG.

Commissioner SODERBERG commented that there are different definitions of the term "built out," and an agreement is needed on the definition of the phrase. The issue of density is a major problem, along with all that is involved, such as the increased need for water and electricity.

Commissioner BROWN clarified that "good faith effort" is when the Housing Element identifies land that can be rezoned to meet the number of units, and if developers fail to build the number of units that the City has allocated for land through the zoning process, that is not a sign of bad faith on the part of the City. The Housing Element, once it is certified by the State, is in essence saying you, in good faith, have made the effort to make land available to meet your housing needs.

Returning to the discussion of open space, the same Commissioner commented that the Parks and Open Space Plan, the General Plan and the Housing Element are all intertwined. But when it is agreed to rezone an area to a much higher density which would yield X number of housing units, the expectation would be that it would yield this number of people living within this area. It would be good planning at the same time to identify the location of the open space to accommodate those people so the open space is not somewhere several miles away because that is the only place where land is available. She said that it is definitely the jurisdiction of the General Plan, but the Housing Element should take that into consideration as well.

Chairperson INKS concurred with Commissioner BROWN with regard to incorporating the open space plan as a part of the General Plan process.

6. **NEW BUSINESS—None.**

7. **COMMISSION/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, QUESTIONS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

7.1 **Possible Upcoming Agenda Items**

a. **September 3—Housing Roundtable**

The Principal Planner explained that several groups will attend the roundtable and give a brief overview of their perspectives and policy recommendations on housing in Mountain View. An opportunity will be available for interaction with the Commission and representatives from these groups to allow the EPC and the community to ask questions and engage in policy-related discussion.

b. **September 17—To Be Determined**

7.2 Announcements

Chairperson INKS and Commissioner ANDERSON spoke about the Community Visioning meeting to be held on Saturday, August 23, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. at the SecondStage of the Center for the Performing Arts. The Principal Planner explained that the format would include consultants interacting with the community and providing information on four topics that are going to be central themes in the General Plan Update: climate change, housing, health and the Grand Boulevard Initiative.

7.3 Requests from Commissioners

Commissioner SODERBERG requested a copy of the Consolidated Plan from staff.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson INKS declared the meeting adjourned with the consensus of the Commission at 8:45 p.m. to the Regular Meeting of September 3, 2008 in the Council Chambers, 500 Castro Street, Mountain View.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin Alkire
Principal Planner

MA/7/CDD
891-08-20-08mn-E^